

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 238

HE 011 336

AUTHOR Stanton, L. Patrick
 TITLE A Descriptive Study of the Role of the Provost in U.S. Higher Education.
 INSTITUTION Chicago State Univ., Ill.
 PUB DATE Dec 77
 NOTE 80p.
 EDES PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); *Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; *College Deans; Higher Education; *Job Analysis; National Surveys; *Occupational Information; Power Structure; State Universities
 IDENTIFIERS Academic Officers; Chicago State University IL; *Provosts

ABSTRACT

The current role of the provost in higher education was investigated to gather data for discussion of the adoption of the provost title at Chicago State University (CSU). The study was based on analyses of the institutional entries in HEW's 1976-77 Education Directory and 1971-72 Directory and on the responses to questionnaires sent to those institutions listing provost titles in 1976-77. The directory analyses showed just 6.5% of institutions listing provosts. At institutions with CSU's characteristics the title's use is minimal. The literature implied a diversity in the use of the title and ambiguity in its meaning, implications confirmed by the questionnaire responses. Respondents (81%) reported a variety of versions of the title, a multiplicity of job descriptions, and a lack of uniformity in the hierarchic rank of the provost. Provosts are more likely to hold sole occupancy of second position in the hierarchy than other positions, but the majority either share second position with others or rank below second position. It is recommended that CSU recognize that the title provost carries no implied responsibility or rank. (Author/MSE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED171234

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY
OF THE ROLE OF THE PROVOST
IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

by

L. Patrick Stanton

for

Chicago State University

December, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Patrick Stanton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AE 611 336

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	11
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	4
PROCEDURES	11
SUMMARY OF DIRECTORY ANALYSIS	22
COMPARISONS BETWEEN ALL INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONS LISTING PROVOST	23
THE CHANGE IN FIVE YEARS	27
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE	31
SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES	34
DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION	52
RECOMMENDATIONS	60
REFERENCE LIST	63
APPENDIXES	
A. INSTITUTIONS WITH PROVOST LISTINGS IN 1976-77 DIRECTORY ALPHABETICALLY BY STATE	66
B. SELECTED STATES BY GREATEST NUMBER AND GREATEST PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS WITH PROVOSTS	69
C. SURVEY LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE	70
D. SUMMARY OF DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRES FROM CATEGORY III INSTITUTIONS	72
E. SUMMARY OF DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED DURING DECEMBER, 1977	74

ABSTRACT

This descriptive study of the current role of the provost in higher education was undertaken to gather data for discussion of the adoption of the provost title at Chicago State University. The study was based on analyses of the institutional entries in HEW's 1976-77 Education Directory and 1971-72 Directory and on the responses to questionnaires sent to those institutions listing provost titles in 1976-77. The directory analyses showed just 6.5% of institutions listing provosts currently, a percentage unchanged in five years, with the greatest use of the title by doctoral degree-granting and high enrollment institutions. At institutions with CSU's characteristics the title's use is minimal. The literature implied a diversity in the use of the title and ambiguity in its meaning, implications confirmed by the questionnaire responses. Respondents (81%) reported a variety of versions of the title, a multiplicity of job descriptions, and a lack of uniformity in the hierarchic rank of the provost. Although the most frequent use of the title was as one word "Provost," the majority of the provost titles cited were in combination with another academic title or with words defining the provost's responsibility. While a plurality of provost title-holders are described as chief academic officers, the majority have responsibilities other than the chief academic. Provosts are more likely to hold sole occupancy of second position in the hierarchy than other positions, but the majority either share second position with others or rank below second position. Therefore, it is recommended that Chicago State in considering adoption of the title should recognize that the title provost carries no implied responsibility or rank. The interpretation of the title will rest entirely with the institution as the national findings emphasize.

INTRODUCTION

This practicum is a descriptive study of the role of the individual with the title of provost in institutions of higher education in the United States currently. The study was made in order to determine: 1) the extent to which the title "provost" is currently being used in higher education, 2) the extent to which its use has changed over five years, 3) the definition of the title of provost from the perception of the institutions where the title is in use, and 4) the place in the institutional hierarchy of the individual with the provost title.

The stimulus for the study came from a recent dialogue between the Faculty Senate of Chicago State University (CSU) and the President of CSU. The Faculty Senate had passed a resolution urging the addition of the title of Provost to the title of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the title currently in use at CSU. The Senate stated that its members believed that this title addition would make that officeholder clearly second in line of authority at CSU, thereby confirming the primacy of academic affairs at CSU.

After an exchange over several weeks, the President agreed to discuss the matters both of the title addition and of the line of authority at CSU with the Senate Executive Committee after the completion of a study of the extent to which the title provost is used in higher education. Both parties agreed to place the responsibility for the study with the Assistant to the President. It was also agreed

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Institutions Listing the Provost Title in the <u>Education Directory</u> for Academic Year 1976-77 in Total and by Highest Level of Offering, by Control, and by Enrollment	22
2. A Comparison by Highest Level of Offering of All Institutions in Higher Education in the Fall of 1975 with Institutions Which Listed Provost Title in Academic Year 1976-77	23
3. A Comparison by Control of All Institutions in Higher Education Fall 1976 with Institutions Which Listed Provost Title in Academic Year 1976-77	25
4. A Comparison by Size of Enrollment of All Institutions in Higher Education in the Fall of 1976 with Institutions Which Listed Provost Title in Academic Year 1976-77	26
5. A Comparison of Numbers and Percentages of Institutions Listing the Provost Title for Academic Years 1971-72 and 1976-77	27
6. Change in Number and Characteristics of Institutions Listing Provost Title from Academic Year 1971-72 to Academic Year 1976-77	28
7. Number and Percentage of Institutions Responding to Survey	31
8. Number and Percentage of Replies to Offer of Summary of the Findings of the Survey	31
9. A Comparison between Numbers and Percentages of All Institutions in Survey and All Institutions Responding by Totals, by Highest Level of Offering, by Control, and by Enrollment	32
10. Number and Percentage of Institutions Responding Which Reported Having the Provost Title or Which Reported Having Dropped the Provost Title	34

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
11.	Number and Percentage of Institutional Citations and Number and Percentage of Total Citations for Each of the Versions of the Provost Title	35
12.	Number and Percentage of Citations for Each General Job Description with Titles	39
13.	Number and Percentage of Provost Title-holders in Each of the Various Positions within the Hierarchy	46.

that special attention in the study should be given to the extent of the title's use in institutions in CSU's category, those offering degrees to the master's level.

The source selected to determine the extent of its use was HEW's Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1976-77, which lists the basic information on every accredited institution of higher education known to the U.S. Office of Education. Included among the data listed for each institution are the academic titles of principal officials including the provost where one exists. An examination was made of approximately 30,000 entries, and a record of every entry containing the title provost was made listing the title itself and the basic characteristics of the institution listing the title. To measure the extent of the use of the title, a comparison was made of the number of institutions with provost title-holders and characteristics of those institutions with the number and characteristics of all U.S. institutions of higher education.

However, a concurrent study of literature on governance seeking references to the provost title raised doubts as to whether the study as originally planned and agreed upon would address the total issue sufficiently to satisfy all concerned. For example, it appeared that the Faculty Senate's interpretation of the title both by implied definition and within an institution's hierarchy was not always the interpretation of writers on governance in higher education. Furthermore, discussion with representatives of two major national educational associations evoked conflicting views regarding the trend in the use of the title.

To anticipate a question regarding the meaning of the title provost itself, which could well arise in later discussion between the President and the Faculty Senate, the study was expanded, with the concurrence of the President, to include a questionnaire. Questionnaires were prepared to be mailed to institutions listing the provost title in the Education Directory seeking each institution's interpretation of the provost title both by definition and by rank within the hierarchy of the institution. Initially, the questionnaire was to have gone to a random sample of institutions with provost title-holders listed, but eventually it went to all such institutions.

In order to have data available on the trend in the use of the provost title, an analysis similar to that made of the 1976-77 Directory was made of all the entries in the 1971-72 Directory to provide for a five-year comparison both in numbers and characteristics.

Finally, to get an indication as to whether this issue of governance was of interest beyond CSU, respondents to the questionnaire were given the opportunity to ask for a summary of the findings.

This expanded study, then, was expected to answer, as fully as possible in the time frame of less than three months, both the initially agreed-upon question and related questions which might prove to be obstacles to the resolution of this issue between the President and the CSU Faculty Senate.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The issue addressed by this practicum was clearly one of internal governance at CSU. On August 2, 1977 the CSU Faculty Senate passed a resolution which in summary urged the President to recognize "the primacy of academic affairs" at CSU by adding the title of provost to the title of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The resolution noted that it was "the understanding of the Faculty Senate" that adding the provost title would make the academic vice president clearly "second in line of administrative authority" serving in the President's absence "as the University's chief administrator" (Minutes, Aug. 2, 1977).

In a memo of August 10, 1977 to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, CSU's president acknowledged the resolution but indicated that "no change will be made at CSU until we learn of the effectiveness of the provost position at the other BOG institutions" (Alexander, Aug. 10, 1977). His reference was to the fact that the title of provost had been adopted in recent months at two of CSU's sister universities within Illinois' Board of Governors system, Northeastern Illinois University and Governors State University. Both of the other institutions in the Board of Governors system (BOG), Eastern Illinois University and Western Illinois University, had used the provost title for several years.

The Senate at its September meeting again addressed the question and passed a motion directing the Senate Executive Committee to "meet with the President to pursue the matter more specifically" on the basis that the President had "neither concurred with nor rejected the resolution" of August 2 (Minutes, Sept. 13, 1977).

Such a meeting between the President and the four members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee took place in the President's office on September 27, 1977 and resulted in a memo to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee from the President which confirmed an agreement on the matter of the provost reached during the meeting. That agreement called for the Assistant to the President, Mr. Patrick Stanton "to study the extent of the use of the title 'provost' in higher education," and that in making the study he would give "particular attention to 'B' category institutions such as CSU," that is, those offering degrees through the master's. (Alexander, Sept. 27, 1977).

In the memo the President also agreed that when the data from the study were available and the Committee had had the opportunity to evaluate the information, another meeting would be held in which he would discuss with the Committee both the matter of the title of provost and the matter of the "person in charge" during any extended absence of the President.

One piece of background information related to the issue was not referred to either in the Senate minutes or in the President's memos. During August, 1977 the President had taken a month's vacation, his first extended vacation during his three year tenure at CSU. He had designated the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, not the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as the person in charge during his absence.

An initial examination of literature on governance over a number of years in which references to the title "provost" are made suggests

that the CSU Senate's understanding that the title of provost carries with it a second in command position at an institution may not be universal. In literature dealing with administrative and organizational structures in higher education, the interpretation of the provost title seems to vary with the interpreter.

Originally, as Duryea (1971) cites, the title was one of several official titles carried over from England as the colonists patterned their first institutions after the English institutions familiar to them. At the time, each of these transplanted titles--warden, master, provost, rector, president--carried "the concept of a permanent headship" (p. 27).

For example, Harvard's first head held the title of master, although only for two years. Yale had a rector as chief executive for its first 40 years (Duryea, 1971). In McGrath's study (1936) of the evolution of administrative offices, he found one instance, the University of Pennsylvania, in which a provost had headed the institution, from Penn's founding in 1756 until 1923. From 1923 to 1930, the university's chief executive carried the dual title of president and provost; then in 1930 the presidential title was given primacy as it had been given earlier at Harvard and Yale.

Perkins (1973) in his Carnegie Commission study on the internal organization of universities refers to McGrath's study but otherwise comments on the "little documentation" on the specifics of admini-

strative expansion in the past century" (p. 29). This paucity of literature may help account for the variety in the content of the references of writers to the provost title.

As an example, Burns (1962) in editing his collection of articles on administrators in higher education includes two writers who comment on the provost title, Horn and Evarson. Horn compares the provost to the vice president or head of a major campus which is "part of a university system" (1962, p. 57). However, in the same collection, Evarson calls the titles of academic vice president, provost, and dean of faculties "interchangeable" (1962, p. 111).

Woodburne (1958), for one, does refer to the provost as a chief executive, but most references to the title imply a position below the chief executive.

Like Evarson, Knowles (1970) in his handbook on administration states that the terms provost and vice president for academic affairs "refer to the same office" (p. 6 - 5). Similarly, Salmen (1971) uses both titles "a vice president for education or provost" (p. 36) for the individual responsible for the academic affairs of the institution. However, he does see that responsibility as distinct from that of the dean of faculties, with the vice president or provost more concerned with "the grand design of the educational program" (p. 36).

On the other hand, Blackwell (1966) treats the two roles alike, relating that in a large university the academic dean may be called "dean of faculties, provost, or vice president for academic administration" (p. 19). Somewhat similarly, Corson (1960) compares the

provost title to the deanship where the dean has "responsibilities for the whole institution" (p. 73).

McVey and Hughes (1952) see the provost in a dual role as "vice president of Faculty and Curriculum" and, as such, appointed "to relieve the president of academic management" and, among other things, "maintain harmony among the colleges" (p. 93).

Although all the references would seem to imply a management capacity over academic matters, only two writers addressed the issue of the position of second in command at the institution. Knowles (1970) in his handbook acknowledges that the administrator responsible for academic affairs "in most institutions serves as second in command to the president" (p. 6 - 5). Horn (1962), however, qualifies his comment on the subject, stating if a vice president or provost "is the number two administrator," the office "usually carries administrative responsibilities other than academic" (p. 62).

Nevertheless, in the definition of "provost" in Dictionary of Education (Good, 1973), no reference is made directly to the title's carrying any implied position in the hierarchy. The definition refers to three uses:

1. Originally, a chief academic or educational administrator,
2. and rarely...the chief administrator of an individual campus in a multicampus institution, and
3. recently and more commonly, a high administrative officer above the rank of dean...in charge of educational activities under the president (p. 455).

Probably most illustrative of the ambiguity of the description of the title in the literature are Knowles' comments (1970), all in one paragraph in his handbook. After having made the statement that in general the terms provost and vice president for academic affairs refer to the same office, he adds that the dual title of "'vice president for academic affairs and provost' is not uncommon." Then compounding the ambiguity, he concludes that the "title provost is often used where the organization does not include vice presidential titles" (p. 6 - 5).

From the literature alone it seemed clear that one could not arrive at a universally-accepted definition of the provost title nor of the rank in institutional hierarchy of a provost. The President agreed that a study devoted solely to determining the extent of the use of the provost title might fall short of providing sufficient data to continue his discussion of the issue with the Faculty Senate. Resolution of the issue would require a meeting of the minds on both the meaning of the title and the implied rank in the hierarchy the title carried. Therefore the study was expanded to include a questionnaire. The objective was to seek information on the definition of the title at institutions currently using it and on the rank of the individual with the title within the hierarchy of such institutions.

Furthermore, the pursuit of additional information on the subject through telephone conversations with officers of two major national educational associations raised another question which seemed relevant to the study. R. Frank Mensel, Executive Director, College and

University Personnel Association (CUPA), stated that he believed that the use of the provost title "was rapidly declining in higher education," while Todd Furniss, Director, Office of Academic Affairs, American Council on Education (ACE), concluded that the use of the title was "increasing because of the flexibility of its meaning."

Just as pertinent as the extent of the current use of the title would seem to be an indication as to whether its use is rising or declining. The method chosen to examine that trend was a comparison between current data and data of five years ago.

To provide as much relevant research as possible to help pave the way for a settlement of this delicate issue of governance at CSU, the study as finally implemented had four facets of the issue to examine: 1) the extensiveness of the use of the provost title currently in higher education in the U.S., 2) the trend in its use, 3) the definition of the title as used, and 4) the rank within the institutional hierarchy of the typical provost title-holder.

In every case, as part of the findings, special attention was to be given to categorizing information as collected according to the characteristics of the institutions. This qualifier was included in keeping with the agreement between the President and the Faculty Senate to have comparative data on institutions similar to CSU, a public institution of 7,000 students offering degrees through the master's.

PROCEDURES

HEW's Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1976-77

was the source for determining the extent to which the title of "provost" is currently in use. This directory contains the basic information on "3,075...institutions in the United States...with at least a 2-year program of college level studies...accredited or preaccredited by an accrediting agency recognized for such purposes by the U.S. Commissioner of Education" (Podolsky & Smith, 1977, p. iii). The assumption was made that it would be unusual for any institution to be omitted which should have been included in the study.

Included in the directory among the data for each institution are such items pertinent to this study as the name and address, the control or affiliation, the highest level of degree offering, the enrollment, and the names and titles, including provost, of principal officers.

All data are updated every year by the Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation (DEAE) of the Bureau of Post-Secondary Education of the U.S. Office of Education and the Higher Education Surveys Branch (HESB) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Because this study was made in the Fall of 1977, the directory for academic year 1977-78, which is scheduled for publication during 1978, was not available.

A visual examination was made of all the entries for 3,047 institutions, all those listed for "The States and D.C." and excluding the nine U.S. Service Schools and 28 institutions in "Outlying Areas,"

that is, those in U.S. territories (p. i). With an estimated average of ten academic offices listed per institutional listing, this entailed an examination of approximately 30,000 academic office entries.

For every instance where a provost title in any form appeared, an individual index card for the institution was prepared. The card carried the name of the president (or chief executive officer) of the institution, the name and address of the institution, its control (public or private) or affiliation, its highest level of offering of degrees, its enrollment, and the title or titles listed carrying the word "provost." All such information was provided by the listing for the institution in the directory.

The index cards were used in analyzing the extent of the use of the title and in analyzing the characteristics of the institutions with the title. They also were eventually used in the comparison made on the trends in the use of the title, and the cards provided addresses for the mailing of the questionnaire.

A one-page questionnaire and a cover letter were prepared. (Samples of the two are in the Appendix). The investigator was at that time in the Office of the President; therefore, the stationery of the Office was used, and the return envelope was addressed to The Office of the President. The salutation for the form letter was "Chief Executive Officer," a salutation covering any title. The envelope was addressed to the individual listed in the directory as the chief executive on the basis that the individual in that office could best answer the questions on duties and hierarchy.

Before the questionnaire was mailed, the name of the institution

and its city and state and the title or titles exactly as printed in the directory were typed on the questionnaire. Usually a separate questionnaire for each provost listing was attached to the cover letter. However, in those cases where it appeared that more than one provost title-holder would have the same job description and the same position in the hierarchy, such as Provost, Jones College; Provost, Smith College, etc., or Provost, North Campus; Provost, East Campus, etc., more than one provost title-holder was typed on the questionnaire. The respondent would seem more likely to respond to one questionnaire than several sheets all requiring the same general response.

To encourage response and simplify tabulating the answers, the questions were limited to the two key areas, the definition of the title and the hierarchic role. A preliminary mailing to test the effectiveness of the questionnaire was not made because of the short time period involved before the data were needed, an unavoidable limitation.

The offer of the summary of the findings was added as the customary reward to those cooperating and also to get some idea from that response as to whether the subject is of interest on other campuses to the extent it is at CSU.

Although prepaid postage on a return envelope normally would encourage responses, in this case economy overrode that consideration. The return envelope required postage to be paid by the respondent.

Initially, the questionnaire was scheduled to go to a sampling of institutions with the provost listing. Institutions were to be selected on a random basis to insure a mailing of at least 100 institutions. However, the total institutions with provost listings were

so much less than anticipated that the questionnaire was mailed to every institution for which a card was prepared.

The questionnaire mailing was made during the first week of October with a request in the letter for a November 1 deadline on the return. No plans were made for a follow-up or second mailing.

The data on the trend in the use of the title of provost came from a comparison of the findings in the directory for 1976-77 with comparable findings in the directory for academic year 1971-72. That year was selected because it fit the traditional five-year period of many statistical studies and 1971-72 marked the first year in which the format of the Education Directory matched the format still in use in the 1976-77 directory.

A comparable visual examination of all the listings in the 1971-72 directory was made; the number of institutions listed for that year was 2,626, about 400 fewer listings and perhaps 4,000 fewer academic title entires than five years hence. The comparison of the 1971-72 directory entries on a page-by-page side-by-side basis with the 1976-77 directory had the effect of a second visual examination of the 1976-77 directory. In that examination, 16 more provost entries for 1976-77 were uncovered. Letters and questionnaires were mailed to the additional 16 asking for return by November 20.

The discovery of additional listings on a second run-through points up a limitation of the study. It is likely that because the entries were examined only twice, every listing of the provost title may not have been included and recorded. However, the fact that the second examination produced an increase of less than 10% would seem to

indicate that any still missed would be in number too few to make any significant difference.

Another limitation out of control of the research is the extent to which institutions may fail to include the provost title in their reports to the various agencies involved in the compilation of the data. One such case is that of CSU's sister institution Eastern Illinois University. Eastern apparently did not choose to report the dual title of "vice president for academic affairs and provost" but rather in the directory just lists its entry as "vice president for academic affairs."

All data gathered for both 1971-72 and 1976-77 were categorized in keeping with the terminology used by the American Council on Education (ACE). ACE's data on enrollment, control, and highest level of offering for all U.S. institutions are published annually in the same format, making comparability over a number of years possible. Furthermore, ACE had certain compilations in its Fact Book not in the Education Directory annuals. With ACE's data, comparison was possible of the characteristics of all institutions with those of the institutions with provosts.

The Education Directory does not include a summary of all institutions by enrollment; ACE's Fact Book does. For enrollment then, all institutions in the study were classified into ACE's four groups: Less than 1,000; 1,000 - 4,999; 5,000 - 9,999; and 10,000 and over. CSU falls into the third group with its 7,025 enrollment.

The Directory does give summary totals on control and breaks the two general classes of public and private into several sub-categories.

But breaking down the recorded institutions into the dozen sub-categories produced numbers too small in many cases to have any significance. All data therefore were compiled to list and compare institutions as either under Public or Private Control.

The 1971-72 directory included totals for all institutions in four categories according to highest level of degree offering; however, the 1976-77 did not provide that total. ACE's Fact Book provides that information for all years through 1975-76, not 1976-77. Therefore, to provide the most effective method of comparability of available data, information gathered was placed in the four ACE categories labeled I, II, III, and IV, rather than the letter categorization which CSU's president had requested. The "B" category for CSU to which he referred, nevertheless, is identical to the III category in this study, that is, an institution offering Master's but less than Doctorate degrees.

After all data had been collected and categorization had been completed, computations were made to prepare Tables 1 through 6 in the Findings section. Data for all institutions in total and grouped into the various categories of the three characteristics under study were compared with similar data for the institutions with provosts. Because this was conceived as a descriptive study, no provision was made for significance testing. Moreover, visual examinations were quite adequate in arriving at conclusions regarding the various comparisons. The data from the 1976-77 directory analysis are presented in Tables 1 through 4.

The data compiled from the 1976-77 analysis were placed in tables with the data from the 1971-72 analysis for a comparison in total and

by characteristics. These are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Table 5 provides the overall comparison, while Table 6 combines all three characteristics in one table, also with visual comparisons adequate.

Initially in the proposal a geographic analysis by state was considered as a possibility. However, the numbers for each state were so small that such a compilation seemed irrelevant. The data for states in which 10% or more of the institutions in the state list a provost in the 1976-77 directory are included in the Appendix.

Because of the later mailing of 16 questionnaires and the intervening Thanksgiving holiday weekend, tabulation was made of all questionnaires received up to December 1. Data received after that date are included in the Appendix.

The information tabulated from the questionnaire survey is presented in Tables 7 through 13. Tables 7 and 8 are merely statistical compilations of those responding in total and of those checking the various responses to the offer for a summary. No interpretation of the data was required before the tables were prepared.

Table 9 which compares the characteristics of the responding institutions with those of the total institutions surveyed required neither interpretation nor significance testing inasmuch as the return itself was so large.

Before the data was gathered for Tables 10 through 13, the decision was made to limit the presentation to information on the "provost" title and to omit reporting replies on vice provosts, associate provosts, assistant provosts and the like. Although a number of questionnaires had been returned of those which went out carrying such subordinate

titles, the number for each subordinate title was relatively small. Most individuals with those titles merely served a provost in some capacity. In only one instance were there vice provosts and no longer a provost. Furthermore, and most germane to the decision, the fact was that the issue at CSU was that of the provost.

Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13 provide the analyses of the survey responses, and in some cases in their preparation interpretation and categorization of responses were required.

Gathering the data for Table 10, which covers the current status of the title, created no problem. Those institutions which had dropped the provost title were very explicit, and the remainder in their responses left no doubt that they were continuing to use the title.

Table 11 required some judgmental classifications. Although every title included in the responses is listed, it was necessary to categorize the titles into more general versions of the title in order to measure the use of the versions of the title. For example, the provost titles in combination with executive vice president, senior vice president, and vice chancellor were all placed in one category, although the number of each was itemized.

Seven categories seemed to embrace all but six of the various versions of the provost title, and those six were listed in an eighth "Other Combinations" group. The title as listed or confirmed on the third line of the questionnaire set the classification of the title. Information on the actual role of the provost title-holder listed below line three did not affect the classifying. In other words, the fact that line 4 in the questionnaire might establish that

an individual with the title "provost" alone was actually head of a branch campus or a college in a system would not cause his reclassification in Table 11. He was counted among the "Provost (single word title) group in the Table.

Table 12 required the greatest amount of interpretation. Given the freedom of "definition, brief job description, or synonym" in the questionnaire, the respondents frequently elaborated on the duties. Fortunately, most of the respondents, however, gave synonyms such as "vice president for academic affairs" or "head of a branch campus." A number sent official job descriptions as printed by the institution.

In some instances it was necessary to make a judgment regarding into which category a job description should be placed. For example, a few in categories 1. and 4. might be interchanged by another interpreter, depending on whether the duties as described are interpreted as primarily academic with just presidential absence responsibilities or as broadly institutional beyond academic and clearly second in command.

A limitation in the classification in 4., 5., and 6. of the chief academic officer is the fact that group 4. was created only because a number of respondents apparently considered it important to add to the job description the information that the provost has deputy or presidential absence responsibilities. Some of the respondents listed in 5. and 6. may also have been describing provosts with similar additional responsibilities but they did not choose to include that information in the definition.

In the case of a few of the responses listed, it was necessary to

downgrade the responses in light of information from comparable institutions within their system or from the hierarchic listing in the questionnaire. For example, a provost of a branch or college in a system may have listed himself under definition only as "chief executive officer" but it may be clear from other material that he does not in fact have that total responsibility for his institution.

Conversely for those in group 9., the fact that they are described in the Table as having responsibilities of a less broad nature is a judgment of the description of the duties. Many of them may rank very high in the hierarchy of the institution otherwise.

Data for Table 13 was evolved, for the most part, simply from the list the respondent made in response to the hierarchy question. If the provost is listed alone on the second line, he is categorized as a sole occupant of second position. If the provost title along with others are listed on the second line, that provost is placed in the next grouping, shared second position.

In a number of responses, instead of marking the item on the sheet, the respondent attached the institution's organizational chart. In such a case, for example, unless the chart showed the provost higher than the other officials on the chart, it was assumed that he shared second position with the others and was placed in that group in the Table.

A judgment similar to that made for Table 12 was made for Table 13 in the case of a few provost heads of branch colleges or campuses. On the questionnaire they might have placed themselves first in the hierarchy, but other information spoke to their being placed into a rank below the overall head of the system or below a coordinating vice.

president. In fact, no provost title-holder was finally placed in the first rank.

Because all but a very few of the provosts appeared on one of the five lines allotted for the ranking on the questionnaire, the space for information on provosts below the fifth position was rarely used. Similarly, relatively few additional comments were made in that space allocated. In both instances, no statistical analysis was made but rather reference was made to any pertinent comments in the narrative of the Discussion section.

The requests for a brief summary of the findings total to a sizeable percentage of the whole. A summary of the highlights of the findings will be reproduced through the Office of the President and mailed to those who requested a copy. This should be accomplished early in February, 1978.

SUMMARY OF DIRECTORY ANALYSIS

TABLE 1.

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS LISTING THE PROVOST TITLE IN THE EDUCATION
DIRECTORY FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1976-77 IN TOTAL AND BY HIGHEST LEVEL
OF OFFERING, BY CONTROL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

Institutions Listing Provost(s)

In Total	198				
By Highest Level of Offering	Category ^a	I	II	III	IV
		24	33	52	89
By Control	Publicly-Controlled				
		101			
	Privately-Controlled				
				97	
By Enrollment	Under 1,000		1,000- 4,999	5,000- 9,999	10,000 and over
		21	65	42	70

^a Category I under Highest Level of Offering is Two but less than Four years; Category II is Baccalaureate and/or First Professional; Category III is Masters and beyond but less than Doctorate; Category IV is Doctor of Philosophy and equivalent. Terminology from American Council on Education.

A total of 198 institutions list the provost title in some form under their entry in the 1976-77 Education Directory. Provosts are found in varying degrees in each category of the three major characteristics selected for analysis.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN ALL INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONS LISTING PROVOST

TABLE 2.

A COMPARISON BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF OFFERING

OF ALL INSTITUTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE FALL OF 1975

WITH INSTITUTIONS WHICH LISTED PROVOST TITLE IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1976-77

<u>Category by Highest Offering</u>	<u>Number and^a Percentage Institutions Each Category Fall 1975</u>	<u>Number and Percentage by Category of Institutions With Provost Title 1976-77</u>	<u>Percentage with Provost Title of All Institutions in Category 1976-77</u>
I (Two but less than 4 years)	1,141 (37.3%)	24 (12.3%)	2.1%
II (Baccalaureate and/or First Professional)	872 (28.5)	33 (16.7)	3.8
III (Masters and beyond but less than Doctorate)	637 (20.9)	52 (26.3)	8.2
IV (Doctor of Philos- ophy and equiva- lent)	405 (13.3)	89 (44.9)	22.0
Total	3,055 (100.0%)	198 (100.0%)	6.5%

^a Fall 1976 data on Highest Offerings not available until Winter 1978.
Fall 1975 data on Highest Offerings from ACE Fact Book on Higher Educa-
tion, March 1977.

A visual examination of the data reveals that it appears the
higher degree offered the more likely the institution will list a

provost title. Category IV, those offering the doctorate, has the largest number (89) listing provost titles and produces the greatest proportion of the institutions with provost title (44.9%), this despite the fact that Category IV institutions comprise only 13.3% of all institutions of higher education.

Similarly, although 37.3% of all institutions are in Category I, those offering less than a bachelors, only 12.1% of the institutions with provost titles are in Category I.

Furthermore, the percentage of institutions in each category which list the provost title increases as the level of degree offering increases. However, only in the case of Category IV, the doctorate level, is the use of the title significantly greater than the overall average of 6.5%. Over one in five (22.0%) of doctoral degree institutions list the provost title.

TABLE 3.

A COMPARISON BY CONTROL

OF ALL INSTITUTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION FALL 1976

WITH INSTITUTIONS WHICH LISTED PROVOST TITLE IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1976-77

<u>Control of Institution</u>	^a <u>Number and Percentage Institutions Each Category Fall 1976</u>	<u>Number and Percentage by Category of Institutions with Provost Title 1976-77</u>	<u>Percentage with Provost Title of All Institutions in Category 1976-77</u>
Publicly- controlled	1,467 (48%)	101 (51%)	6.9%
Privately- controlled	1,608 (52%)	97 (49%)	6.0%
Total	3,075 (100%)	198 (100%)	6.4%

^a
Total Number and Percentage figures for all institutions are available for 1976 in Education Directory for 1976-77. This accounts for the slight difference in number of institutions from the number in Table 2, which was for Fall 1975.

From a visual examination of the data, it is apparent that there is no significant difference between the proportion of publicly and privately controlled institutions in total and the proportion in those two categories of institutions listed with a provost title in the 1976-77 directory. Nor is there a significant difference between the percentages of public (6.9%) and of private (6.0%) institutions with a provost listed.

TABLE 4.

A COMPARISON BY SIZE OF ENROLLMENT OF ALL INSTITUTIONS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE FALL OF 1976 WITH INSTITUTIONS
WHICH LISTED PROVOST TITLE IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1976-77

<u>Category by Enrollment</u>	^a <u>Percentage of All Institutions in Each Category Fall 1976</u>	<u>Number with Provost Title in Each Category 1976-77</u>	<u>Percentage in Each Category of Institutions with Provost Title 1976-77</u>
Less than 1,000	42%	21	10.6%
1,000 - 4,999	38	65	32.8
5,000 - 9,999	11	42	21.2
10,000 and over	8	70	35.4
Total	^a 99%	198	100.0%

^a
Numbers and percentages by size of enrollment for 1976-77 are not listed in Education Directory. Percentage only data for all institutions for Fall 1976 available from ACE's Fact Book on Higher Education.

Visually it is apparent that the greatest number of institutions with provost title listings are found in the highest enrollment category (10,000 and over) with 70 listings and in the next to smallest enrollment category (1,000 - 4,999) with 65 listings. However, the higher the enrollment it seems the more disproportionate is the category's share of institutions with provosts as compared to its share of all institutions. The proportion for the smallest category (10.6%) is one quarter of the 42% which might be expected, while the proportion for the largest enrollment category (35.4%) is over four times greater than the 8% which might be expected.

THE CHANGE IN FIVE YEARS

TABLE 5.

A COMPARISON OF NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF INSTITUTIONS

LISTING THE PROVOST TITLE

FOR ACADEMIC YEARS 1971-72 AND 1976-77

<u>Academic Year</u>	^a <u>Total Institutions Listed</u>	<u>Total Institutions Listing Provost Title</u>	<u>Percentage Institutions Listing Provost Title</u>
1971-72	2,608	172	6.59%
1976-77	3,038	198	6.51%
Increase since 1971-72	430 (16.5%)	26 (15.1%)	

^a
Total includes all institutions in "Aggregate U.S." directory listing except service schools and those in U.S. territories. Therefore, total figure excludes 18 institutions in the 1971-72 Education Directory and 27 institutions in the 1976-77 directory.

The effect of the increase of 430 or 16.5% over five years in total number of institutions listed and the increase of 26 or 15.1% in institutions listing the provost title results in no significant change over the five years in the percentage of institutions listing provosts--6.59% and 6.51%.

TABLE 6.

CHANGE IN NUMBER AND CHARACTERISTICS
OF INSTITUTIONS LISTING PROVOST TITLE
FROM ACADEMIC YEAR 1971-72 TO ACADEMIC YEAR 1976-77

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number Listing Provost Title 1971-72</u>	<u>Percentage Listing Provost Title 1971-72</u>	<u>Dropping Provost Title Since 1971-72</u>	<u>Adding Provost Title Since 1971-72</u>	<u>Number Listing Provost Title 1976-77</u>	<u>Percentage Listing Provost Title 1976-77</u>
All Insti- tutions	172	100.0%	49	75	198	100.0%
By Highest Level of Offering						
I	20	11.7%	3	7	24	12.2%
II	27	15.7	11	17	33	16.7
III	43	25.0	12	21	52	26.2
IV	82	47.6	23	30	89	44.9
Total	172	100.0%	49	75	198	100.0
By Control						
Publicly- controlled	84	48.8%	20	37	101	51.0%
Privately- controlled	88	51.2	29	38	97	49.0
Total	172	100.0%	49	75	198	100.0%

TABLE 6. CONTINUED

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>Listing</u> <u>Provost</u> <u>Title</u> <u>1971-72</u>	<u>Percentage</u> <u>Listing</u> <u>Provost</u> <u>Title</u> <u>1971-72</u>	<u>Dropping</u> <u>Provost</u> <u>Title</u> <u>Since</u> <u>1971-72</u>	<u>Adding</u> <u>Provost</u> <u>Title</u> <u>Since</u> <u>1971-72</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>Listing</u> <u>Provost</u> <u>Title</u> <u>1976-77</u>	<u>Percentage</u> <u>Listing</u> <u>Provost</u> <u>Title</u> <u>1976-77</u>
By Enrollment						
Less than 1,000	20	11.6%	10	11	21	10.6%
1,000 - 4,999	53	30.8	17	29	65	32.8
5,000 - 9,999	32	18.6	7	17	42	21.2
10,000 and over	67	39.0	15	18	70	35.4
Total	172	100.0%	49	75	198	100.0%

In keeping with the overall increase in provosts listed between 1971-72 and 1976-77, an increase is noted in the four categories under Highest Level of Offering, in the two categories under Control, and in the four categories under Enrollment. In each category the combination of drops and adds resulted in a net increase.

The greatest increase in Highest Level of Offering was Category III, Master's level, an increase of nine. Under Control, public institutions had a net increase of 17 as compared with an increase of nine for private institutions. Under Enrollment, the increase in the number

was greatest in the two middle categories with 12 additional in the 1,000 - 4,999 category and 10 additional in the 5,000 - 9,999 category.

Overall, however, in all three characteristic comparisons, a visual examination shows that no significant change took place in the percentage proportions within any of the three categories.

RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE 7.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING TO SURVEY

<u>Total Institutions Sent Survey</u>	<u>Number of Institutions Responding</u>	<u>Percentage of Institutions Responding</u>
198	161	81.3%

The return on the mail questionnaire was over four out of five, which seems a high return for a survey of one mailing and no follow-up. Data from additional questionnaires returned after the tabulation was completed are included in the Appendix.

TABLE 8.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF REPLIES

TO OFFER OF SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF SURVEY

<u>Response to Offer to "Send a brief summary of the findings"</u>	<u>Number in Each Category Replying</u>	<u>Percentage in Each Category Replying</u>
Yes	115	71.4%
No	16	10.0
No response to item	30	18.6
Total	161	100.0%

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (71.4%) indicated a desire to see a summary of the findings; only 10% actually declined the offer.

TABLE 9.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES
 OF ALL INSTITUTIONS IN SURVEY AND ALL INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING
 BY TOTALS, BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF OFFERING, BY CONTROL, AND BY ENROLLMENT

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number and Percentage by Category of Institutions in Survey</u>	<u>Number and Percentage by Category of Institutions Responding</u>	<u>Percentage Responding of Total for each Category of Institution</u>
Total Institutions	198 (100.0%)	161 (100.0%)	81.3%
By Highest Level of Offering			
I	24 (12.1)	22 (13.7)	91.6
II	33 (16.7)	23 (14.3)	69.7
III	52 (26.3)	46 (28.5)	88.5
IV	89 (44.9)	70 (43.5)	78.7
Total	198 (100.0)	161 (100.0)	81.3
By Control			
Publicly- Controlled	101 (51.0%)	82 (50.9%)	81.9%
Privately- Controlled	97 (49.0)	79 (49.1)	81.4

TABLE 9 (continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number and Percentage by Category of Institutions in Survey</u>	<u>Number and Percentage by Category of Institutions Responding</u>	<u>Percentage Responding of Total for each Category of Institution</u>
By Enrollment			
Less than 1,000	21 (10.6%)	14 (8.7%)	66.7%
1,000 - 4,999	65 (32.8)	56 (34.8)	86.2
5,000 - 9,999	42 (21.2)	36 (22.3)	85.7
10,000 and over	70 (35.4)	55 (34.2)	78.6
Total	198 (100.0)	161 (100.0)	81.3

It is apparent from a visual examination of the data that there is no significant difference between the institutions surveyed and the responding institutions in the percentage proportions within any of the three characteristics being compared.

In addition, institutions responding were well-represented in every category of the three characteristics, ranging from a high of 91.6% of the eligible two-year institutions (Category I under Highest Level) to a low of 66.7% of the eligible institutions with Less than 1,000 enrollment. The concentration of response percentages was around the norm of 81.3%.

Because of that concentration and the fact that the high and low percentages are in categories of small numbers, there is no significant skew in the responses as a Chi Square test would confirm.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES
REGARDING CURRENT STATUS OF PROVOST TITLE

TABLE 10.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING
WHICH REPORTED HAVING THE PROVOST TITLE OR WHICH REPORTED HAVING DROPPED
THE PROVOST TITLE

<u>Total Institutions Responding</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Reporting Current Provost Title</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Reporting Provost Title Dropped</u>
161	150 (93.2%)	11 (7.8%)

The Education Directory listing was for academic year 1976-77.
The survey was made at the beginning of academic year 1977-78.
Almost all of the institutions (93.2%) reported the continuation of
their use of the provost title. However, it would appear that 7.8%
dropped the title since the 1976-77 report.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR
CONFIRMATION OF PROPER TITLE OF PROVOST

TABLE 11.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONAL CITATIONS
AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CITATIONS FOR
EACH OF THE VERSIONS OF THE PROVOST TITLE

<u>Version of the Provost Title</u>	<u>Number and Percentage of Institutions Reporting Each Version</u>		<u>Number and Percentage of Total Citations Reported for Each Version</u>	
Provost (single word title)	73	48.0%	74	38.7%
Provost in combination with a top vice presidential type title	11	7.2	11	5.8
--Provost and Executive Vice President (4)				
--Executive Vice President and Provost (4)				
--Provost and Vice Chancellor (1)				
--Senior Vice President and Provost (2)				
Provost in combination with single title vice president	12	7.9	12	6.3
--Vice President and Provost (10)				
--Provost and Vice President (2)				

TABLE 11. (continued)

<u>Version of the Provost Title</u>	<u>Number and Percentage of Institutions Reporting Each Version</u>		<u>Number and Percentage of Total Citations Reported for Each Version</u>	
Provost in combination with an				
academic vice president type title	18	11.8%	18	9.4%
--Provost and Vice President				
Academic Affairs (11)				
--Vice President Academic				
Affairs and Provost (5)				
--Provost and Vice Chancellor				
Academic Affairs (2)				
Provost in combination with an				
academic dean title	9	5.9	9	4.7
--Provost and Dean of				
Faculty (2)				
--Provost and Dean of				
Faculties (3)				
--Provost and Dean of				
Academic Affairs (1)				
--Provost and Dean of				
College (2)				
--Dean of Faculty and				
Provost (1)				

TABLE 11. (continued)

<u>Version of the Provost Title</u>	<u>Number and Percentage of Institutions Reporting Each Version</u>		<u>Number and Percentage of Total Citations Reported for Each Version</u>	
Provost in a title with a college or division name	9	5.9%	23	12.0%
Provost in a title with a campus name	14	9.2	38	19.9
Provost in other combinations	6	3.9	6	3.1
--Provost for Administration				
--Provost for Alternative Education				
--Provost, Educational Services				
--Provost for External Affairs				
--Provost-Research-Institutional Development				
--Provost, <u>(name)</u> University Center				
Total	152	99.8%	191	99.9%

Of all the institutions reporting the existence of the provost title, almost half (48.0%) use the single word title Provost. The remaining 52% report the use of the title in many different combinations, with the next largest institutional use a total of 16 with the "Vice President Academic Affairs" title.

Of the 191 different instances in which the provost title was

reported in use at the institutions, its use in the single word title Provost occurs most frequently with 38.7% of the citations. Two other relatively numerous uses are in a title with a campus name and in a title with a college or division in the name. Campus provosts account for almost one in five (19.9%) of those cited, and college and division provosts, that is, the provost of a named college or division within the institution, account for 12%.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR DEFINITION OF PROVOST TITLE

TABLE 12.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF CITATIONS
FOR EACH GENERAL JOB DESCRIPTION WITH TITLES

<u>General Job Description Category and Titles Cited in Each General Category</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Reported for Each General Job Description Category</u>	
1. Second in command or deputy chief with broad institutional responsibilities	16	8.4%
--Provost title alone (8)		
--Provost and top vice presi- dential title combination (3)		
--Provost and vice president title alone combination (1)		
--Provost and vice chancellor academic affairs comb. (2)		
--Provost and academic dean title combination (2)		
2. Combined responsibility from combination of titles with Provost title signifying broad deputy chief responsibilities and other title signifying chief academic office responsibilities	3	1.6%
--Provost and academic vice presi- dential title combination (2)		
--Provost and academic dean title combination (1)		

TABLE 12. (continued)

General Job Description Category and Titles Cited in Each General Category	Number and Percentage Reported for Each General Job Description Category	
3. Combined responsibility from combination of titles with Provost title signifying chief academic officer responsibilities and other title signifying broad deputy chief responsibilities	4	2.1%
--Provost and top vice presidential title combination (4)		
4. Chief academic officer with deputy or presidential absence responsibility specifically included in definition	26	13.6
--Provost title alone (14)		
--Provost and vice president title alone combination (2)		
--Provost and academic vice president combination (7)		
--Provost and academic dean combination (3)		

TABLE 12. (continued)

<u>General Job Description Category and Titles Cited in Each General Category</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Reported for Each General Job Description Category</u>	
5. Chief academic officer with some additional responsibilities cited (student life, budget, etc.)	6	3.1%
--Provost title alone (4)		
--Provost and top vice presidential title combination (1)		
--Provost and academic vice president combination title (1)		
6. Chief academic officer responsibilities only cited	43	22.5%
--Provost title alone (25)		
--Provost and top vice presidential title combination (3)		
--Provost and vice president title alone combination (9)		
--Provost and academic vice president title combination (3)		
--Provost and academic dean title combination (3)		

TABLE 12. (continued)

General Job Description Category and Titles Cited in <u>Each General Category</u>	Number and Percentage Reported for Each General Job Description <u>Category</u>	
7. Head of an academic division or college(s)		
within an institution, similar to a dean	23	12.0%
--Provost and name of college		
in title (16)		
--Provost and name of colleges		
in title (1)		
--Provost and name of academic		
division in title (6)		
8. Head of a campus in a multi-campus system	52	27.2%
--Provost title alone (14)		
(in a community college		
of a state system--8)		
(in a four year branch of		
a state university system--4)		
(in a branch in a community		
college system--2)		
--Provost with name of campus		
in title (38)		
(in a community college		
system--32)		
(in a university system--6)		

TABLE 12. (continued)

General Job Description Category and Titles Cited in Each General Category	Number and Percentage Reported for Each General Job Description Category
9. Other responsibilities of a less broad nature than described above	15 7.9%
--Provost title alone (8) (including assistant to the president (2); chief budget officer; public relations head; head of extension campus; head of educational research and evening division; coordinator of external campus deans; co-leader academic affairs)	
--Provost and academic vice president title combination (1) (co-leader academic affairs)	
--Provost with designated responsi- bility in title (6) (includes Provosts for Administration, for Alternative Education, for Educational Services, for External Affairs, for Research and Institutional Development, and of The _____ University Center as coordinator of academic programs for a five private college system)	

TABLE 12. (continued)

<u>General Job Description Category and Titles Cited in Each General Category</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Reported for Each General Job Description Category</u>	
10. No response to survey question	3	1.6%
--Provost title alone (1)		
--Provost and academic vice president title combination (2)		
Total	191	100.0%

The most frequent use of the Provost title in the tabulation is found in the category of Head of a campus in a multi-campus system with 52 citations, or over one in four (27.2%) of the total provosts reported. The next most frequent job description reported is that of the chief academic officer with no other responsibilities cited, with 43 mentions or 22.5% of the total.

However, the determination of the most frequently mentioned responsibility of a provost title-holder can best be made by combining categories. The provost's responsibility as chief academic officer is an important part of the job description in five categories, No. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The fact is then that the provost's role as chief academic officer is mentioned in 86 instances or for 45% of all provost title-holders reported.

Similarly, the provost's role as deputy chief or acting chief in the chief executive's absence is also referred to in more than one

category. That role is a key factor in categories 1, 2, 3, and 4. The sum of those four categories would indicate that this deputy chief factor is important to the provost role in 49 instances or 25.7% of the total reported.

The other fairly frequent role mentioned for provost title-holders is that of heads of colleges or divisions within an institution, with duties similar to deans at other institutions. This category includes 23 provost title-holders or 12.0% of the total.

The provost title alone appears 73 times in the survey. Provost alone appears in all the general categories except 2. and 3., which entries call for a combination of titles, and 7., which entries carry a college or division name in the title.

Provost title alone is eight times in category No. 1, the second in command grouping, 14 times in No. 4, the group defined as the chief academic officer with deputy responsibilities, four times in No. 5, the academic chief with added responsibilities, 25 times in No. 6, the category for those with solely chief academic duties, 14 times in No. 8, which contains heads of campuses, and eight times in No. 9, the group with lesser responsibilities.

Combining categories 4., 5., and 6., those in which chief academic officer is the key element, gives a total of 43 entries or 58.9% of the 73 citations. Campus heads makes up 19.2% of the provost title alone group, while the second in command category and the group with lesser responsibilities comprise 11% each.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR LIST OF HIERARCHY BY TITLE

TABLE 13.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PROVOST TITLE-HOLDERS

IN EACH OF THE VARIOUS POSITIONS WITHIN THE HIERARCHY

<u>Position in Institutional Hierarchy and Titles Cited for each Position</u>	<u>Number of Provost Title-holders and Percentage of All Provost Title-holders in the Position</u>	
Sole occupant of Second Position	86	45.1%
--Provost title alone (43)		
--Provost and Executive Vice President (4)		
--Executive Vice Presi- dent and Provost (3)		
--Provost and Senior Vice President (1)		
--Senior Vice President and Provost (1)		
--Provost and Vice President (2)		
--Vice President and Provost (8)		
--Provost and Vice Chancellor (1)		
--Provost and Vice Chancel- lor Academic Affairs (2)		
--Provost and Vice Presi- dent Academic Affairs (6)		

TABLE 13. (continued)

<u>Position in Institutional Hierarchy and Titles Cited for each Position</u>	<u>Number of Provost Title-holders and Percentage of All Provost Title-holders in the Position</u>	
Sole occupant of Second Position (continued)		
--Vice President Academic Affairs and Provost	(5)	
--Provost and Academic Vice President	(1)	
--Provost and Dean of College	(2)	
--Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs	(1)	
--Provost and Dean of Faculties	(2)	
--Provost and Dean of the Faculty	(3)	
--Provost, <u>(name)</u> University Center	(1)	
Sharing Second Position with Other Officials,		
i.e., vice presidents, deans and other provosts	50	26.2%
--Provost title alone	(11)	
--Provost and Vice Presi- dent Academic Affairs	(4)	

TABLE 13. (continued)

<u>Position in Institutional Hierarchy and Titles Cited for Each Position</u>	<u>Number of Provost Title-holders and Percentage of All Provost Title-holders in the Position</u>	
Sharing Second Position with Other Officials (continued)		
--Provost and Dean of Faculty (1)		
--Provost with Campus Name in Title (22)		
--Provost with College or Division Name in Title (9)		
--Provost with Responsibility Named in Title (3) (Administration; Alternative Education; Educational Services)		
Sole occupant of Third Position	8	4.2%
--Provost title alone (6)		
--Vice President and Provost (1)		
--Provost with Responsibility in Title (External Affairs) (1)		
Sharing Third Position with Other Officials, i.e., vice presidents, deans, other provosts, etc.	30	15.7%
--Provost title alone (11) ^a		

TABLE 13. (continued)

<u>Position in Institutional Hierarchy and Titles Cited for Each Position</u>	<u>Number of Provost Title-holders and Percentage of All Provost Title-holders in the Position</u>	
Sharing Third Position with Other Officials (continued)		
--Vice President and Provost (1)		
--Vice President and Pro- vost with Campus Name (2)		
--Provost with Campus Name in Title (13)		
--Provost with College Name in Title (3)		
Sole occupant of Fourth Position	1	0.5%
--Provost title alone (1)		
Sharing Fourth Position with Other Officials, i.e., deans and other provosts	11	5.8%
--Provost with Campus Name in Title (4)		
--Provost with College Name in Title (7)		
Sharing Sixth Position with Other Officials, i.e., associate vice presidents and other provosts	2	1.0%
--Provost with College Name in Title (2)		

TABLE 13. (continued)

<u>Position in Institutional Hierarchy and Titles Cited for Each Position</u>	<u>Number of Provost Title-holders and Percentage of All Provost Title-holders in the Position</u>	
Sole occupant of Seventh Position	1	0.5%
--Provost title alone (1)		
No Position in Hierarchy; i.e., no line authority	1	0.5%
--Provost title alone (1)		
No Response to the Survey Question	1	0.5%
--Provost, Research, Insti- tutional Development (1)		
Total	191	100.0%

^a Ten of the 12 Provosts listed as sharing third position are identified in the questionnaires as holding the position of chief executive officer of the campus or community college they head; however, their institutions are not autonomous and they therefore are listed as ranking third in the hierarchy of the system under which they operate.

More provost title-holders are listed as sole occupants of second position in their institutions than are listed for any other position, slightly less than half, 45.1%. Those sharing second position with others

comprise better than one of four, 26.2%. Over 90% rank in the third position, alone or shared, or above in the hierarchy.

Of those carrying the single word title provost, 43 of the 74, or 58.1%, are sole occupants of second position. However, the title does appear in almost every position listed down to seventh.

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

A first impression from the analysis of the listings in the 1976-77 Education Directory would be that the CSU Faculty Senate is recommending a title for the CSU academic vice president currently in very limited use in higher education today. With just 6.5% of U.S. institutions using the title, it might even be construed that the provost title might be disappearing as Duryea (1973) reported has happened to the rector, master, and warden titles. Even if it is conceded, as was mentioned in the Procedures section, that some few provost titles might have been missed in the directory examination and that some institutions may have failed to report a provost title (e.g., Eastern Illinois University), it seems unlikely the total would increase significantly.

In Category III, the Master's level into which CSU would fall, the percentage increases to 8.2% of all such institutions listing a provost, not significantly greater than the national norm of 6.5%. In fact, no special analysis was feasible of the institutions with all three characteristics similar to CSU's, that is, public control with enrollment of 5,000 - 9,999 and the master's the highest level offered. Only eight of all such institutions in the U.S. list a provost.

The control-public or private-seems to be no factor in the extent of the use of the provost title. However, the doctoral degree-granting institutions and those in the highest enrollment group (10,000 plus) do have a disproportionately large number of the provost listings. Nevertheless, even though doctoral degree institutions

provide almost half of the provost listings, only 22% of all such institutions have provosts. Furthermore, regarding the enrollment factor, although the Fact Book and, as a result, Table 4 give percentages rather than numbers, one can approximate a national figure. Eight per cent of all U.S. institutions have enrollments of 10,000 or more, i.e., 8% of 3,075 or 246 institutions. The 70 in the group with provost listings represent only 28.5% of all such institutions.

In light of the relatively modest use of the provost title at all levels, the fact that the issue arose at CSU would seem surprising. Two factors not apparent in the tables may on speculation have had some influence. The first might be the historic nature of the provost title, as referred to by Duryea (1973), Good (1973), and McGrath (1936), which would have appeal to anyone in academia. Even today, of the nation's ten oldest universities, five continue to use the provost title in some fashion--Yale, Princeton, Penn, Brown, and Rutgers. Two others of the ten, Columbia and Dartmouth, listed provosts in 1971-72 but not currently.

The other factor which may have influenced the CSU faculty is the current use of the title in CSU's home state of Illinois. The University of Illinois, the traditional leader in public higher education in the state, did at one time have a provost, being among those who dropped the title since the 1971-72 listing. Furthermore, although the Appendix shows only eight of the 149 total institutions in the state with a provost, these eight include four of the state universities: Illinois State, Northern Illinois, Southern Illinois-Edwardsville, and Western Illinois, and three of the most prestigious private universities: U. of Chicago, Illinois Institute of Technology, and Northwestern. In addition, as noted, Eastern Illinois University has

provost unlisted in the 1976-77 directory, and Governors State and Northeastern Illinois both have adopted the title since the directory was published.

From the comparison of the listings for 1971-72 and 1976-77 in Table 5, it would appear that neither Dr. Mensel of CUPA nor Dr. Furniss of ACE was correct about the trend. Despite the many additions and deletions of the title, the proportion of total U.S. institutions using the provost title has remained at a constant of 6.5%. Furniss was accurate in stating that the use was increasing; there are 27 more institutions with provosts than five years ago. But that increase has merely kept pace with a like increase in total institutions.

Relative to the question of the completeness of the Education Directory listings is the fact that 124 institutions did report either a drop or an add of the title. Presumably, institutions do keep their listings current.

No striking change took place over the five years in any of the characteristics reported in Table 6. In addition to their being no upward or downward trend in the overall use of the title, there is also no such trend in the kinds of institutions adding or dropping the title.

As evidenced in Table 7, the cooperation from the surveyed institutions was remarkable. Including the late returns presented in the Appendix makes a total of 167 or 83.4% return, evidence perhaps that the survey's subject struck a responsive chord. Also indicative of that interest may be the total of 71.4% of the respondents who went to the trouble of checking off a request for a summary.

Another example of that general interest in the subject of provosts

may be the results of an incidental analysis made of the signators of the questionnaires. The president of the responding institutions signed over a quarter (26.1%), the individual with the provost title signed 28.6% of the forms, and the assistant to the president signed 16%, with the balance from 20 other officials. Further evidence of either the interest in the subject or the simplicity of the questionnaire may be the fact that about half of the questionnaires were filled in by hand by the signator.

Not one respondent made a negative comment regarding the value of the study itself. A few in their comments did seem to identify with the ambiguity of the title noted in the literature (see Burns, 1962; Knowles, 1970; Good, 1973). One president added the comment that "as this study indicates, there remains a great deal of confusion over the title." The president of an institution which recently dropped the title commented that the change from provost to academic dean was made "purposely to avoid ambiguity." Another noted that the institution is gradually changing the provost titles to deans, having so far dropped from seven to three provosts.

Because of the great number of returns, Table 9, as would be expected, merely confirms that the returns are very representative of the whole.

Table 10 shows that eleven of the respondents have dropped the title since the last directory, a fluidity in the use of title also evident in the comparison between 1971-72 and 1976-77. Of the 172 institutions listing a provost in 1971-72, 28.5% had dropped it by 1976-77. If eleven of the current institutions drop the title each

year for five years, the total of 55 would represent a comparable 27.7% five-year total drop.

Table 11 illustrates the effect of time on the original use of the title (e.g., Duryea, 1973; Good, 1973). The literature did not predict the great variety of versions in which the provost title is found currently. Only Knowles (1970) had commented on a dual title version; others mentioned the title as being used as a synonym for other titles (Blackwell, 1966; Evarson, 1962; Horn, 1962; Salmen, 1971), but not as being used in combination with the other titles.

Although the single word title "provost" is the most frequently used version, by far the majority of the citations in Table 11 are in combinations of the word provost with other academic titles or academic terms. One interesting phenomenon is the lack of uniformity in the combinations of titles. In almost every instance of a combined title, some institutions place the provost title first and others last, e.g., four list "executive vice president and provost" and four list "provost and executive vice president." Also worth noting are the 20% of the citations which have a campus as part of the title. Good's (1973) calling such a use "rare" in his definition would no longer seem accurate.

Perhaps the profusion of combination titles comes from the implicit ambiguity of the provost title. In some cases, institutions may have added a second title to clarify the provost title. Other uses may hearken back to the original concept of "a permanent headship" (Duryea, 1970, p. 27), but now the application is to the heading up of

a campus, a college, a division, or some other area of academic responsibility rather than the original headship of the entire institution.

Table 12 emphasizes further the diverse use of the title. Over one quarter of the citations are for campus heads, a responsibility only Good (1973) and Horn (1962) had mentioned. More writers cited chief academic responsibilities than any other role for the provost (Blackwell, 1966; Corson, 1960; Evarson, 1962; Good, 1973; Knowles, 1970; McVey, 1952; Salmen, 1971); chief academic leadership for the institution is included as all or part of the job description of more provost title-holders than any other with mention in 45% of the descriptions. Conversely, of course, that responsibility is not important in the majority of 55% of the job descriptions.

The CSU Faculty Senate inferred a deputy or at least presidential absence responsibility in the provost title. A similar inference can be drawn from some of the returns in the Table. As noted, 26 respondents added that duty to the chief academic officer definition. On the other hand, a much larger number did not mention that responsibility in the job description of the academic chief.

The responses for category 2. and 3. in Table 12 may illustrate, perhaps more than any other example, the existing freedom of interpretation. The responses listed in these two categories are those in which a separate job description was given for each half of a dual title. Where the provost title is combined with a form of chief academic officer, the provost title is reported to carry broad deputy responsibilities for the entire institution. However, where the provost

title is combined with a top vice presidential title, the provost portion carries chief academic responsibilities.

The range of the application of the title is apparent from the inclusion of the single word title "provost" in every other job category. Furthermore, most of the 15 provosts listed in the "Other responsibilities" category have neither deputy chief nor chief academic responsibilities. They perform a multitude of duties.

Probably the most unusual, and perhaps the ultimate, use of academic titles was reported by an institution recently created through the merger of a men's college and a women's college. The organization chart shows the institution headed by a president supported by four vice presidents of equal hierarchical rank. However, there are two assistants to the president, neither having line authority. One who watches out for "women's concerns" has the title of provost. The other assistant, who presumably attends to men's concerns with a similar position on the chart as the provost, carries the title of chancellor.

Another interesting example not included in the table is one where the provost title has been dropped and three vice provosts head up academic affairs, budget and administration, and student affairs, a situation which the respondent called "anomalous in the absence of a Provost but...on this campus...well understood."

From the final table, Table 13, one can infer that individuals with provost titles usually rank high in the hierarchy of their institutions. In almost half the citations, such individuals are sole occupants of the second position. However, another 26% of the pro-

vost title-holders share that second position with others. Furthermore, in over one quarter of the citations the title-bearer ranks below second position. Clearly the title often includes deputy chief status, but the responses show that responsibility is by no means implicit in the title.

In summary then, the provost title is not in general use in higher education currently, with only 6.5% of institutions listing such a title, a percentage unchanged since five years ago. The title is used most frequently by doctoral degree granting institutions (22% have provost title-holders) and by institutions with high enrollment (28% of those with 10,000 or more students have provost title-holders). Its use at institutions with CSU's characteristics is minimal.

The most frequent single use of the title is as one word "Provost." Nevertheless, the majority of the provost title citations appear in a combination of academic titles or with words defining the provost's responsibility, be it a campus, a college, or an administrative area of the institution.

Similarly, while a plurality of provost title-holders are described as the chief academic officers, the majority have responsibilities other than chief academic.

Finally, provost title-holders are more likely to hold sole occupancy of second position in the hierarchy than any other place in the ranks. However, the majority of provost title-holders are not sole occupants of second rank. They either share second rank with others or rank below second position.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted at the direction of the President of CSU with the concurrence of the CSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee only to gather data. A resolution of the issue of a provost at CSU was not the objective of the study. Resolution of that issue is the objective of a discussion to be scheduled between the President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee after the findings have been studied by both parties. Nevertheless, some comments and recommendations seem appropriate.

Solely on the basis of the findings on the extent to which the provost title is in use in higher education in the United States currently, which was the original aim of the study, there would seem to be little impetus for the adoption of the title at CSU. The use overall is very minimal, and in institutions with characteristics similar to those of CSU--under public control, enrollment between 5,000 and 9,999, and highest level master's degree, the use of the title is almost rare. Just eight such institutions listed the title.

Furthermore, as the survey revealed, both the use of the title and the meaning of the title vary from institution to institution. Only 16 institutions list a title similar to that proposed by the Senate--Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, or the reverse. Even among those 16 the duties and ranks reported vary.

No doubt the adoption of the title at many of Illinois' state universities helped trigger the issue at CSU. However, it should be noted that the University of Illinois, which may have been the first or

at least among the first in the State of Illinois with the title, has dropped the title. From the list in the Appendix of all institutions reporting provosts, it does not appear as though the title is as prevalent at state universities in any other state with a comparable number of state universities as it will be in Illinois.

The Senate's resolution stated that it was the Senate's understanding that adding the Provost title would make the academic vice president second in line of administrative authority and serving in the president's absence as chief administrator. As the survey shows, it would seem that such an understanding would be presumptuous. Provosts often are second in command, and provosts frequently serve in the president's absence. However, the title assures neither role. In fact, the majority of the provost title-holders reported in the findings have neither that exclusive rank nor that responsibility.

Nor do the findings show that the adoption of the title would automatically place the title with the academic vice president. Although a provost is often a chief academic officer, the data indicates that the title could be granted to almost any individual in an institution's hierarchy. Furthermore, in a number of institutions the title belongs to an officer of the university with broad responsibility for all areas, not just academic, similar to that of an executive vice president.

If the Senate's principal objective is to establish "the primacy of academic affairs," as the resolution states, this could be accomplished without the potentially ambiguous title of provost. The issue of establishing the individual who is second in command does not depend on the creation of a provost title nor, as the findings show, does

the creation of a provost necessarily settle the issue of second in command responsibility.

The obvious recommendation evolving from the study is cautionary. All involved should recognize that the title of provost has only limited implied meaning itself. As verified by the variety of versions of the title, by the multiplicity of job descriptions, and by the lack of uniformity in the rank of the provost within the hierarchy, it should be clear that the role of the provost depends almost entirely on the interpretation of the institution where he or she serves.

Whatever the final resolution of the issue may be, it is hoped that if an individual is granted the title of provost or some comparable title at CSU, he or she will fulfill the role in a manner similar to that of the provost described by one of the respondents. From a small southern college came this description of the role of its provost: "Technically, second in command. Practically, wise counselor to the President and the Administration."

REFERENCE LIST

Alexander, B. H. Memorandum to Dr. Magne Olson, Chairman of the Faculty Senate. Chicago State University correspondence files, August 10, 1977.

Alexander, B. H. Memorandum to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Chicago State University correspondence files, September 27, 1977.

Andersen, C. (Ed.) A Fact Book on Higher Education: Institutions, Faculty and Staff, Students. Washington: American Council on Education, Third issue, 1976.

Blackwell, T. E. College and University Administration. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

Burns, G. P. (Ed.) Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.

Corson, J. J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.

Duryea, E. D. Evolution of University Organization. In Perkins, J. A. (Ed.), The University as an Organization. A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.

Education Directory, 1971-72, Higher Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Evanson, H. The Academic Vice President or Dean. In G. P. Burns (Ed.), Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.

Good, C. V. (Ed.), Dictionary of Education. (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.

Horn, F. H. The Organization of Colleges and Universities. In G. P. Burns (Ed.), Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.

Knowles, A. S. Handbook of College and University Administration - Academic. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970.

McGrath, E. J. The Evolution of Administrative Officers in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States from 1860 - 1933. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1936.

McVey, F. L. & Hughes, R. M. Problems of College and University Administrators. Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Minutes of the Chicago State University Faculty Senate Meeting, August 2, 1977.

Minutes of the Chicago State University Faculty Senate Meeting, September 13, 1977.

Perkins, J. A. (Ed.), The University as an Organization. A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.

Podolsky, A. & Smith, C. R. Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1976-77. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Salmen, S. Duties of Administrators in Higher Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1971.

Woodburne, L. S. Principles of College and University Administration. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

APPENDIX A

Institutions with Provost Listings in 1976-77 Directory Alphabetically

By State

Alabama

1. Tuskegee Institute

Alaska

Arizona

2. Northern Arizona Univ.

Arkansas

3. Univ. of Arkansas

California

4. Univ. of Calif. - Berkeley
5. Stanford Univ.
6. Fuller Theological Seminary
7. Loyola Marymount Univ.
8. Claremont Colleges
9. Evergreen Valley Coll.
10. University of Redlands
11. Calif. Inst. of the Arts
13. Lone Mountain College
14. Univ. of the Pacific
15. Univ. of Calif. - Santa Barb.
16. Univ. of Calif. - San Diego
17. San Jose State Univ.
18. Univ. of Calif. - Santa Cruz
19. Miller Comm. College

Colorado

Connecticut

20. Univ. of Hartford
21. Univ. of New Haven
22. Fairfield Univ.
23. Quinnipiac Coll.
24. Yale Univ.
25. Post College
26. Bridgeport Engineering Inst.

Delaware

27. Univ. of Delaware

D.C.

28. Catholic Univ. of America
29. George Washington Univ.

Florida

30. Hillsborough Comm. Coll.
31. Broward Comm. Coll.
32. Univ. of West Florida
33. Valencia Comm. Coll.
34. Florida State Coll.
35. Rollins Coll.

Florida (cont.)

36. Brevard Comm. Coll.
37. Florida Jr. Coll. of Jacksonville
38. Eckerd Coll.

Georgia

39. Medical Coll. of Georgia
40. Univ. of Georgia
41. Georgia State Univ.

Hawaii

42. U. of Hawaii Leeward Comm. Coll.
43. U. of Hawaii Kapiolani Comm. Coll.
44. U. of Hawaii Kauai Comm. Coll.
45. U. of Hawaii Honolulu Comm. Coll.
46. U. of Hawaii Maui Comm. Coll.
47. U. of Hawaii Windward Comm. Coll.
48. U. of Hawaii at Hilo

Idaho

Illinois

49. Illinois State Univ.
50. Illinois Inst. of Technology
51. Blackhawk Coll.
52. Western Illinois Univ.
53. Univ. of Chicago
54. Southern Ill. Univ. at Edwardsville
55. Northern Illinois Univ.
56. Northwestern Univ.

Indiana

57. Univ. of Notre Dame
58. Goshen Coll.
59. Indiana Northern Grad. Sch. of Prof. Mgmt.
60. Earlham Coll.

Iowa

61. Univ. of Northern Iowa

Kansas

Kentucky

62. Northern Kentucky Univ.
63. Southern Baptist Theological Sem.
64. Centre Coll. of Kentucky

Louisiana

65. Tulane Univ. of Louisiana

Maine

Maryland

66. Univ. of Maryland College Park Camp.
67. Saint Mary's Coll. of Maryland

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Institutions with Provost Listings in 1976-77 Directory AlphabeticallyBy State (Continued)

Massachusetts

- 68. Northeastern Univ.
- 69. Univ. of Lowell
- 70. Simmons Coll.
- 71. Wentworth Institute
- 72. Wheaton Coll.
- 73. Williams Coll.
- 74. Tufts Univ.
- 75. Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.
- 76. Boston Univ.

Michigan

- 77. Hope Coll.
- 78. Michigan State Univ.
- 80. Kalamazoo Coll.
- 81. Alma Coll.
- 82. Oakland Comm. Coll.
- 83. Oakland Univ.
- 84. Wayne State Univ.
- 85. Northern Michigan Univ.

Minnesota

- 86. Univ. of Minn. at Crookston
- 87. Univ. of Minn. at Duluth
- 88. Univ. of Minn. at Morris
- 89. Univ. of Minn. Tech. Coll.

Mississippi

Missouri

- 90. Northwest Missouri State U.
- 91. Univ. of Missouri - Rolla
- 92. Univ. of Missouri - Kansas City

Montana

Nebraska

- 93. Univ. of Nebraska - Omaha

Nevada

New Hampshire

- 94. Univ. of New Hampshire

New Jersey

- 95. Stevens Inst. of Tech.
- 96. Montclair State Coll.
- 97. Rutgers...Camden Campus
- 98. Princeton Univ.
- 99. Fairleigh Dickinson U.
- Rutherford Camp.
- 100. Fairleigh Dickinson U.
- Teaneck Camp.
- 101. Fairleigh Dickinson U.
- Madison Camp.

New Jersey (continued)

- 102. New Brunswick Theological Sem.
- 103. Rutgers...New Brunswick Camp.
- 104. Rutgers...Newark Campus

New Mexico

- 105. Univ. of New Mexico Main Camp.

New York

- 106. New York Inst. of Tech.
- 107. Hofstra Univ.
- 108. Hobart-William Smith Coll.
- 109. Elmira Coll.
- 110. SUNY College at Old Westbury
- 111. Pratt Inst.
- 112. Union Coll.
- 113. Bank Street Coll. of Education
- 114. Fashion Inst. of Technology
- 115. Cornell Univ.
- 116. Molloy Coll.
- 117. SUNY at Buffalo Main Campus
- 118. Manhattan Coll.
- 119. CUNY Queens College
- 120. Fordham Univ.
- 121. Rochester Inst. of Technology
- 122. CUNY Hunter College
- 123. Colgate Univ.
- 124. CUNY City College
- 125. SUNY College at Oswego
- 126. Ithaca Coll.
- 127. SUNY College at Brockport
- 128. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.
- 129. Polytechnic Inst. of New York
- 130. Hamilton Coll.

North Carolina

- 131. North Carolina State U. at Raleigh
- 132. Duke Univ.
- 133. East Carolina Univ.
- 134. Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- 135. Campbell Coll.
- 136. Wake Forest Univ.
- 137. Fayetteville State Univ.

North Dakota

- 138. Jamestown Coll.

Ohio

- 139. Oberlin Coll.
- 140. Bowling Green State Univ.
Main Camp.
- 141. Capital Univ.
- 142. Ohio Univ.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Institutions with Provost Listings in 1976-77 Directory AlphabeticallyBy State (Continued)

Ohio (Continued)

- 143. College of Steubenville
- 144. Denison Univ.
- 145. Kenyon Coll.
- 146. Kent State Univ. Main Camp.
- 147. Wright State U. Main Camp.
- 148. Case Western Reserve Univ.
- 149. Univ. of Cincinnati Main Camp.
- 150. Ohio State U. Main Camp.

Oklahoma

- 151. Univ. of Oklahoma
- 152. Oral Roberts Univ.

Oregon

- 153. Reed Coll.

Pennsylvania

- 154. Lafayette Coll.
- 155. Carnegie-Mellon Univ.
- 156. Chatham Coll.
- 157. Comm. Coll. of Philadelphia
- 158. Haverford Coll.
- 159. Lehigh Univ.
- 160. Swarthmore Coll.
- 161. Bucknell Univ.
- 162. Penn. State Univ. Capitol Camp.
- 163. U. of Pittsburgh Main Camp.
- 164. Penn State Univ. Main Camp.
- 165. Univ. of Pennsylvania
- 166. Penn State U. Hershey Med. Camp.
- 167. Gannon Coll.

Rhode Island

- 168. Brown Univ.
- 169. Rhode Island Sch. of Design
- 170. Univ. of Rhode Island

South Carolina

- 171. Winthrop Coll.
- 172. Columbia Bible Coll.
- 173. Univ. of S. Carolina Main Camp.

South Dakota

- 174. Univ. of South Dakota

Tennessee

- 175. Univ. of Tenn. at Martin
- 176. Meharry Medical Coll.
- 177. Tennessee Technol. Univ.
- 178. Univ. of the South

Texas

- 179. Southern Methodist Univ.
- 180. Rice Univ.
- 181. Texas A&M Univ. Moody Coll. of Marine Sci. & Maritime Resources

Utah

- 182. Utah State Univ.

Vermont

Virginia

- 183. Southside Virginia Comm. Coll.
- 184. Univ. of Richmond
- 185. Northern Virginia Comm. Coll.
- 186. Virginia Commonwealth Univ.
- 187. Old Dominion Univ.
- 188. J. Sargeant Reynolds Comm. Coll.
- 189. Univ. of Virginia Main Camp.
- 190. Tidewater Comm. Coll.

Washington

- 191. Pacific Lutheran Univ.
- 192. Evergreen State Coll.
- 193. Whitman Coll.
- 194. Univ. of Washington

West Virginia

- 195. West Virginia Univ.
- 196. West Virginia State Coll.

Wisconsin

- 197. Beloit Coll.
- 198. Univ. of Wisconsin Center System

Wyoming

APPENDIX B

Selected States by Greatest Number and Greatest Percentage of Institutions with Provosts

<u>State</u>	<u>Total Institutions Listed in 1976-77 Directory</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Listing Provost Titles</u>
--------------	---	---

-- Data for States with Ten or more Provost Listings --

New York	287	25 8.7%
California	252	16 6.3
Pennsylvania	179	14 7.8
Ohio	131	12 9.2
New Jersey	65	10 15.4

-- Data for States with Ten Percent or more Provost Listings --

Hawaii	11	7 63.6%
Rhode Island	12	3 25.0
New Jersey	65	10 15.4
Connecticut	46	7 15.2
Florida	73	9 12.3
Virginia	73	8 11.0
District of Columbia	19	2 10.5

-- Data for States with 100 or more Listings Not Listed Above --

Illinois	149	8 5.4%
Massachusetts	119	9 7.6
North Carolina	116	7 6.0
Texas	146	3 2.1

ChicagoStateUniversity
Office of the President
Ninety-Fifth Street at King Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60628
Telephone 312/995-2400

APPENDIX C

Survey Letter and Questionnaire



October 3, 1977

Dear Chief Executive Officer:

I have been asked to conduct a study for Chicago State University on (1) the extent to which institutions use the academic title "Provost," (2) their definition of that title, and (3) the place of the provost in their hierarchy. A preliminary review of the literature seems to indicate that there are differences in current interpretations of both the provost title and of his or her role on campus.

Therefore, I am sending a brief questionnaire to a sampling of the institutions who list the provost title in HEW's Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1976-77. Yours is one of those which lists that title in the directory.

I would appreciate someone from your office completing the questionnaire, to the extent possible, and returning it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by November 1.

Should your office be interested in a summary of the findings of this descriptive study, please so indicate on the questionnaire. No institution's response will be identified individually in the findings.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

L. Patrick Stanton
L. Patrick Stanton

Assistant to the President

LPS:cp
Encls.

APPENDIX C (Continued)

PROVOST SURVEY

71.

Please return to: Mr. L. Patrick Stanton
Assistant to the President
Chicago State University
Ninety-Fifth Street at King Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60628

Institution: _____

Education Directory Listing: _____

Proper title if Directory
listing is incorrect: _____

Definition of the above title,
or a brief job description, or
a synonym for the title: _____

Hierarchy by title within the
institution in declining order
beginning with the chief executive
officer of the institution (if
such a hierarchy is established):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

If the individual with the provost title does not appear in the rank of the top
five administrators, please explain below where that position ranks:

Additional comments: _____

Send a brief summary of
the findings:

Yes _____ No _____

Name _____

Title _____

APPENDIX D

Summary of Data from Questionnaires from

Category III Institutions (Highest Level--Master's Degree)

<u>Total Respondents</u>	<u>Control</u>		<u>Enrollment</u>			
	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>-1M</u>	<u>1-5M</u>	<u>5-10M</u>	<u>10M+</u>
46	27	19	5	21	9	11

<u>Total Institutions Reporting a Provost</u>	<u>Total Provost-Titles Reported</u>	<u>Total Institutions Reporting Dropping the Provost Title</u>
41	42	5

Summary of Titles Reported by Name

	<u>Number</u>
Provost	23
Provost with top vice president combination	3
Provost with vice president combination	2
Provost with academic vice president combination	7
Provost with academic dean combination	2
Provost with a college name in title	4
Provost in an Other combination	1

Summary of Definitions by Category

<u>Responsibilities</u>	<u>Provost Titles</u>							<u>Total</u>
	<u>Alone</u>	<u>With Top V.P.</u>	<u>With V.P.</u>	<u>With Acad. V.P.</u>	<u>With Acad. Dean</u>	<u>With Coll. Name</u>	<u>With Other</u>	
1. Second in command	7	1	1	1				10
3. Dual title		1						1
4. Academic with deputy	4			4	2			10
5. Academic with additional	1			1				2

APPENDIX D (Continued)

Summary of Data on Category III Institutions (continued)Summary of Definitions by Category (continued)Total

<u>Responsibilities</u>	<u>Provost Titles</u>							
	Alone	With Top V.P.	With V.P.	With Acad. V.P.	With Acad. Dean	With Coll. Name	With Other	
6. Academic only	5	1	1	1	1			9
7. Head of college						4		4
8. Head of campus	2							2
9. Other than above	3						1	4

Summary of Positions in HierarchyTotal

<u>Positions</u>	<u>Provost Title</u>							
	Alone	With Top V.P.	With V.P.	With Acad. V.P.	With Acad. Dean	With Coll. Name	With Other	
Second Position alone	14	3	2	6	3			28
Second Position shared	1			1		2	1	5
Third Position alone	5							5
Fourth Position alone	1							1
Sixth Position shared						2		2
No line authority	1							1

For expanded explanations of the categorization under the Summary above of titles, definitions, or positions, see Tables 11, 12, and 13 in the Findings.

APPENDIX E

Summary of Data from Questionnaires Received During December, 1977

after Completion of Survey Tabulation

<u>Total Respondents</u>	<u>Highest Degree</u>				<u>Control</u>		<u>Enrollment</u>			
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>-1M</u>	<u>1-5M</u>	<u>5-10M</u>	<u>10M+</u>
6	0	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	1	2

All of the six respondents requested a summary of the findings.

Summary of Titles

	<u>Number</u>
Provost	3
Senior Vice President and Provost	1
Vice President and Provost	1
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	1

Summary of Definitions

	<u>Number</u>
Second in command with broad institutional responsibilities	2
Chief academic officer with presidential absence responsibilities	1
Chief academic officer	3

Summary of Positions in Hierarchy

	<u>Number</u>
Sole occupant of Second Position	5
Sole occupant of Third Position	1